

Christian Education

VOLUME V
OCTOBER, 1921-JULY, 1922

Published Monthly, Omitting August and September, by
THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

Robert L. Kelly, *Editor*

111 Fifth Avenue

New York. N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter October 24th, 1921, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3d, 1917, authorized on July 18th, 1918.

The subscription price is 50 cents per annum; ten or more copies 40 cents each, 10 cents must be added if payment is made by check. Single copies, 10 cents each.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Published by the Council of Church Boards of Education in the United States of America.

VOL. V.

DECEMBER, 1921

No. 3

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Program of the Annual Meeting of the Council . . .	3
The Program of the Conference of Church Workers in Universities	4
The Schedule of Denominational Group Meetings . . .	5
The Program of the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges	5
The National Convocation of Colleges and Universities on International Disarmament	7
Pertinent Paragraphs	10
Denominational Co-operation in Religious Education at State Universities	12

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION WEEK IN CHICAGO

As previously announced, the annual meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education is to be held at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, January 9 and 10, 1922.

PROGRAM

MONDAY, 10 A.M.

The Annual Reports:

Rev. Paul Micou, President.

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary.

Dr. O. D. Foster, University and Seminary Secretary.

Dr. E. P. Hill, Treasurer.

Reception of New Members.

The Appointment of Committees.

MONDAY, 2.00 P. M.

Post-war Methods of Raising Money:

Dr. John W. Hancher, Councillor in Finance, Methodist-Episcopal Board of Education.

Dr. E. P. Hill, General Board, Presbyterian Church.

Dr. J. A. Reynolds, Board of Education, Methodist-Episcopal Church, South.

Dr. G. I. Hoover, Board of Education, Disciples of Christ.
General Discussion.

MONDAY, 7.30 P. M.

The Report of the Committee on University Centres:

Rev. Paul Micou, Chairman.

Dr. O. D. Foster, University Secretary.

General Discussion.

The Summer Conferences:

Dr. O. D. Foster, Dean.

General Discussion.

TUESDAY, 9 A. M.

Report of the Committee on Colleges:

Dr. H. H. Sweets, Chairman.

A Study of the Disciples Colleges:

Dr. Robert L. Kelly.

Suggestions for Colleges from the St. Louis Survey:

Dr. H. Paul Douglass.

General Discussion.

TUESDAY, 2 P.M.

Report of Committee on Religious Education:

Dr. Frank M. Sheldon, Chairman.

Reports of Committees:

Nominations, Audit, Budget.

Proposed Changes in the Constitution and By-Laws.

The Work for the New Year.

Unfinished Business.

TUESDAY, 7.30 P.M.

***Report of the Committee on Life Work:**

Dr. W. H. Crothers, Chairman.

Educational Advice and Direction of College Students:

Director Stephen S. Colvin, School of Education, Brown University.

The Personal Touch:

Dean Thomas Arkle Clark, the University of Illinois.

Church Work Among Women Students:

Miss Agnes M. Hall, Department of Religious Education, Protestant Episcopal Church.

General Discussion:

Dr. William J. Davidson, David R. Porter, Miss Lucy Helen Pearson and others.

* A joint session with the Conference of Church Workers in Universities.

PROGRAM**THE CONFERENCE OF CHURCH WORKERS IN UNIVERSITIES**

This Conference will meet January 10th, 11th and 12th, at the Edgewater Beach Hotel.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10TH, 7.30 P.M.

Program arranged by the Council of Church Boards of Education, with special reference to Church Workers.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11TH, 9 A.M.

Reports by Four Commissions:

Commission No. I.—The housing of students at Universities. Has the Church a responsibility in the matter? The record of experience.

Commission No. II.—Methods of Church Work in Universities. What are they? How successful? Is there a better Method? The record of experience.

Commission No. III.—Shall these Conferences be continued?

What is their purpose? Is it accomplished? Should students be present?

Commission No. IV.—Can there be developed in our Universities a ministry adequate for present and future needs? What is an adequate ministry? What is an adequate preparation?

TOPICS FOR SUBSEQUENT SESSIONS

Board Secretaries will explain the National Program of their respective churches for Universities.

Written authorized reports of United Programs will be read.

Suggestions for university workers from the St. Louis Survey.

Nature of work with the girls will be reported.

Some special studies of students will be presented.

A new Constitution will be submitted.

Denominational meetings will be held.

Adjourn Thursday afternoon.

DENOMINATIONAL GROUP MEETINGS

Educational Board, Christian Church, Edgewater Beach, January 11th, 2 P. M.

Board of Education, Disciples of Christ, Auditorium Hotel, January 12, 9 A.M.

Board of Education, Friends, Auditorium Hotel, January 11, 9 A.M.

The National Lutheran Educational Conference, Auditorium Hotel, South Parlor, January 11 and 12.

The Educational Association, Methodist Episcopal Church, Evanston, January 11, 2 P.M., and January 12.

The Presbyterian College Union, Hotel Sherman, January 11th, afternoon and evening, and McCormick Theological Seminary, January 12, morning and afternoon.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

Eighth Annual Meeting

Auditorium Hotel, Chicago

PROGRAM

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 6.30 P.M.

**College Objectives and Ideals:*

President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University.

* NOTE.—Members and their friends who attend this session will send \$2.00 each to the manager of the Auditorium Hotel for a reservation at the dinner.

Chancellor James H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University.

President Ellen F. Pendleton, Wellesley College.

The Announcement of Committees.

FRIDAY, 9.30 A.M.

The Reception of New Members.

The Report of the Association Commission on the Organization of the College Curriculum:

Dr. Robert L. Kelly.

President Frederick C. Ferry.

General Discussion.

The University and the American Worker:

Spencer Miller, Jr., Secretary, Workers' Education Bureau of America.

The Report of the Association Treasurer.

FRIDAY, 2.15 P.M.

The Report of the Association Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure:

Dean Charles N. Cole, Oberlin College.

General Discussion.

Report of the Association Commission on Sabbatical Leave:

Dean O. E. Randall, Brown University.

General Discussion.

The Congregational Foundation for Education:

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

FRIDAY, 7.45 P.M.

Education for Symmetry:

President Arthur E. Morgan, Antioch College.

Report of the Association Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship:

President Frederick C. Ferry.

General Discussion

Report of the Association Commission on Architecture:

President Raymond M. Hughes, Miami University.

Discussion.

SATURDAY, 9 A.M.

Report of the Association Commission on the Distribution of Colleges:

Dr. Robert L. Kelly.

Dr. George F. Zook, the United States Bureau of Education.

Discussion.

Professorial Salaries:

United States Commissioner John J. Tigert.

Limiting the Number of Students:

Dean Howard McClenahan, Princeton University.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

At the National Convocation of Colleges and Universities on International Disarmament, held in Chicago on November 13 and 14, almost two hundred institutions, located in forty-three States of the Union, were represented by delegates. This meeting was first conceived by Dr. A. W. Harris, the Corresponding Secretary of the Methodist Episcopal Board of Education, who originally planned it as a meeting for Methodist Episcopal colleges, universities and foundations. As the idea grew in his own mind, he called into consultation some of his friends, with the ultimate result that it became a convocation of national scope, with practically every national agency in the country directly responsible for the religious life and training of students in our institutions of higher learning joining in the call.

The first session was devoted to addresses by Sherwood Eddy, of the National Y. M. C. A.; Dr. Charles A. Tindley, of Philadelphia; Charles Denby, Jr., of Princeton University, and Rev. Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, of New York City. Dr. A. W. Harris, of the Methodist Episcopal Board of Education, served as temporary chairman, and Dr. Robert L. Kelly, of the Council of Church Boards of Education, was appointed as permanent chairman.

The subsequent sessions were devoted to business, two important items of which are here made a matter of record.

A Continuation Committee was designated, with Dr. Kelly as chairman and Dr. Harris as secretary and treasurer, who were given power to appoint additional members. With them have now been associated Mr. A. C. Monahan, of the National Catholic Welfare Council; Rabbi Rudolph Grossman, of the Central Association of Jewish Rabbis; Charles Denby, Jr., of Princeton

University; Professor Charles H. Judd, of the University of Chicago; General Nathan William MacChesney, 30 N. La Salle St., Chicago (the College of the Pacific) : Miss Arvia Mackaye, of Miami University; Dean Mary Malloy, of St. Teresa College, and Miss Marjorie Marston, of Vassar College.

The Convocation changed the name to the National Convocation of Universities and Colleges on International Relations.

The Convocation adopted by unanimous vote the following resolutions, the receipt of which was later graciously acknowledged by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State:

Resolved, that the National Convocation of Universities and Colleges on International Relations, including representatives of more than two hundred universities and colleges assembled at Chicago, November, 12, 13 and 14, 1921, desires to express its deep appreciation of the importance and significance of the step which the President of the United States has taken in calling the conference at Washington on the limitation of armaments and related matters.

Resolved, that this Convocation expresses with unqualified enthusiasm its hearty approval of the auspicious beginnings of the conference already made, and of the words of the President and of the Secretary of State, which express, we believe, not only the purposes of the administration, but the heart and conscience of the people of America.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this conference it is a matter of supreme consequence and of happy augury that various nations of the world have sent their delegates to Washington to discuss the limitation of armaments and to dispose of existing difficulties that may menace the peace of the world.

Resolved, that it is our belief that the subjects to be discussed by the conference at Washington deeply affect the welfare of the world and that the students, alumni and faculties of the colleges and universities here represented most earnestly hope that in the spirit already shown every effort will be made in good faith and in high honor to achieve the purposes for which the conference was called, namely:

The limitation of armaments;

The reduction of armies to the lowest practicable limits;

And that the underlying causes of war, such as the disputes or differences of apparent interest in the Pacific, be composed in the spirit of harmony and good will.

Resolved, that in the opinion of the Convocation the public should be made acquainted with the stages of the progress of the conference so far as consistent with the deliberations of the conference, and that the final conclusions and the reasons for reaching them be fully published to the world.

Resolved, that the Convocation expresses the hope that the conference may be a first step leading to international co-operation for the preservation of peace.

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and to all colleges and universities.

General Nathan William MacChesney,

University of Michigan.

Charles S. Deneen, McKendree College.

Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago.

Charles H. Judd, Wesleyan University.

Edward A. Miller, Oberlin College.

And in addition, be it further

Resolved, that this Convocation, aroused by the consideration of the great problems now under discussion at Washington, calls the attention of college and university officers and students to the necessity of providing more fully than do present courses of instruction in American educational institutions for an intelligent understanding of the problems of national and international life. To the end that present defects in these matters be corrected, it is urged that courses of instruction be provided which shall acquaint students in schools and colleges with the fundamental necessity of social co-operation and the disastrous consequences of the lack of international harmony and war.

It is a matter of great interest to note also that immediately following the last session of the Convocation "The National Student Committee for the Limitation of Armaments" was organized. Since that time President Emeritus Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard, has accepted the position of Honorary Chairman and General Nathan William MacChesney of Treasurer of this

committee, and John Rothschild, Secretary of the Collegiate Liberal League, that of Executive Secretary.

PERTINENT PARAGRAPHS

If any of the subscribers to **CHRISTIAN EDUCATION** can spare the following issues we will esteem it a special favor to have them sent in to us: **The American College Bulletin**, Vol. I, Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18; Vol. II, Nos. 1, 2, 5; **CHRISTIAN EDUCATION**, Vol. IV, No. 4 (January, 1921.)

A few copies of half leather binding of Volume IV of **CHRISTIAN EDUCATION**, consisting of approximately 376 pages, are available at actual cost, that is, \$2.00 plus postage.

The Board of Education of the Evangelical Association in its annual meeting in November received most encouraging reports of their educational institutions and formulated a progressive policy for the next year. It is interesting to note that there is an increase in attendance of about thirty-three and one-third per cent. in the Evangelical Theological Seminary and that in a total attendance of 550 students in North-Western College 146 are preparing for definite Christian work.

At the annual meeting of the Commission on Secondary Education of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States Dr. Kelly presented the desirability of a definition of a unit of Biblical History and Literature with a view to credit for admission to college. As a result, the Commission recommended and the Association later adopted the Definition of a Unit of Bible Study made by the Commission of the Council of Church Boards of Education. By this action a large number of institutions are added to the list of more than two hundred universities and colleges that have already approved this definition.

The Kent Conferences—Professor Charles Foster Kent, Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature of Yale University, has been released the first semester of the present school year to study the religious life, the religious agencies and the religious possibilities of our State Universities and denominational colleges of the Middle West. During this time he has motored 5,000 miles, delivered 135 lectures, and spent more than 125 hours in open conferences with faculties, students, ministerial associations and

general agencies. He has addressed between 50,000 and 75,000 students.

Among the institutions visited were the Universities of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan and Ohio State, including many of the denominational colleges of these states. He has been greeted in these centers by large enthusiastic audiences. His addresses before Associations, Chambers of Commerce, Rotary, Kiwanis and Women's Clubs, have met with unusual response. The result of these addresses and conferences on the vital, social and religious issues of the day, has been phenomenal.

On visiting the centers where Professor Kent has been, one constantly hears it said that his unusual success has been due to a unique combination of personal qualities and abilities. His wide range of human sympathy, ability to sense the bottom of a difficulty, and extensive acquaintance with student and denominational problems and peculiarities have been tactfully expressed through a rare wealth of sanity and Christian charity.

During these conferences numerous lives have been quickened, programs vitalized, ideals projected, organizations inspired and communities drawn together. The University authorities and Religious Workers consider his quiet campaign of educational evangelism to be both abiding and far reaching. Finding the faculties and Religious Workers of several State Universities deeply interested in developing Schools of Religion, he has, at their request, co-operated with them in the further development of their plans for such schools.

The general verdict of those attending the Kent conferences has been that all have been led to nobler heights in their vision of service and to greater depths in their consecration to their common Master.

O. D. FOSTER.

Mr. R. H. Fitzgerald, the General Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. of the University of Iowa, in a glowing account of Dr. Kent's meetings at that institution says that during Dr. Kent's stay in Iowa City he gave a number of students a larger conception of religion, helped some to clear up conflicts in their minds, and for others the Bible became interesting. He helped

the leaders of the church classes to realize the possibilities of the work which could be done for the 700 students enrolled in their classes if the courses were co-ordinated and organized. He prepared the way for the Religious Education Committee of the Interdenominational Board to make constructive suggestions to the churches regarding this work. He stimulated more interest in the Affiliated Schools of Religion. He was especially stimulating to the Faculty. He was sane and constructive and we feel that his visit was extremely helpful. Incidentally it may be remarked that Professor Kent addressed a class in philosophy, the Freshman Convocation, the joint meeting of the Town and Gown, the student church class leaders, the Association Cabinet, the faculty, church classes, the Vespers and a union church service.

DENOMINATIONAL COOPERATION IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AT STATE UNIVERSITIES

O. D. FOSTER

That the under-graduate subjects in religious education afford a natural basis for denominational cooperation, has become self-evident to the educator in this field. Yet, with all of the advancement made in this direction and with the numerous examples of its actual working, there are many not acquainted with the field who do not recognize that such can even be possible. The many instances of cooperation in denominational education are not seen and the fact is not advertised.

In various fields many types of subjects are being taught cooperatively with scarcely a thought about it. For example, the citizens of the commonwealth hold divers views relative to methods of instruction and content of courses in commerce, law and medicine, yet they cooperate in giving courses, which in the judgment of their official representatives, will produce the best results for all concerned.

The public is greatly divided on industrial and political questions, but this does not preclude the possibility, or even practicability of teaching economics and politics to classes whose members entertain every variety of opinion on these subjects. The various theories and points of view are presented and each

must survive or perish in accordance with its own inherent worth.

People have confidence that from the interchange of ideas will issue genuine convictions based upon intelligent study of fact; that is to say, they believe that truth will not suffer in the study. They are convinced that the different views held by members of the class at the conclusion of the course, will be no longer mere opinions, but convictions held because other views did not seem tenable. No one expects the professor, who may be a Democrat, to make Democrats of all of his students, nor one who may be a Republican, to deliver his whole group for the Republican ticket. The American people have confidence in the triumph of truth in the field of general knowledge, even in such subjects as economics and politics, but seem to be fearful for the results of having the basic facts of their religion subjected to free and open discussion. Many are inclined to wonder why this is the case. Different reasons are assigned for this apparent mistrust and fear. Among the most common of these reasons are temperamental difference, prejudice and ignorance.

To many, temperamental difference is final and insurmountable. That is, to them, these "natural and inherited differences" are such fundamental factors in human behaviour that it would be futile for persons differently endowed, to attempt to study religious phenomena together. Should the Methodist, with his warmth of heart, be expected to find his greatest joy in educational fellowship with his cold-headed Congregational neighbor? Should it be hoped that temperaments so different as those found in the high church Episcopal and the democratic Baptist families could have much in common? To many it would seem that these differences are explicable only on the basis of inherent natural differences between the adherents of these communions. One appreciates form, beauty and impressive ritual, whereas the other appears to be more at home in the informal simple democratic service. It is argued, therefore, that nature itself is responsible for these apparently irreconcilable forms of religious expression.

The fallacy of this conclusion is made apparent when the basic assumption of temperamental oneness within a given denomination is exposed. The whole position assumes that the

individuals of one group are differently constituted by nature from those of other groups and that within denominational families is homogeneity. As a matter of fact heterogeneity of temperament is quite as rife within groups as between groups. This assumed uniformity could only be maintained by constant selections and choices, and thus by a continual realignment of individuals within groups. Though temperament played no small part in bringing into existence these different forms of religious expression as advocated by the various communions, it was possible because of the fewness of kindred spirits who voluntarily joined themselves into a group through organization and creed to express in the best possible way, their own religious spirit and genius. Once the organization was formed, enthusiastic promoters and missionaries, through zeal and persuasion, gained other adherents. Children were born into the homes, and new generations joined the organization, thus bringing divers natural temperaments within the group, for nothing is better established than the fact that children may differ in temperament fundamentally from the parent. In the great majority of cases, membership in particular churches is due to accident, either of birth or of environment, rather than to deliberate choice, based on temperamental difference.

Prejudice is another assigned barrier to cooperative efforts in the field of religious instruction. Heated controversies on doctrine, vested interests and fields of effort have forgotten unpleasant memories which in many quarters, have been studiously cherished, consequently wherever the interest of one group touches the interest of another group, suspicion and prejudice appear.

Religious prejudice is in most cases the daughter of ignorance and the sister of bigotry. Bigotry and intolerance in the other fellow is despicable. Of course, these "relics of more primitive developments," can only survive anachronistically in a denomination less advanced and enlightened than one's own. His Satanic Majesty has most generously bestowed all these evils upon other less favored groups, leaving one's own church free of all such antediluvian impedimenta, thanks to the rewarding love of God to his own peculiar people, whom he hath especially called to guard the faith once for all delivered to the

Saints and whom he hath further appointed to bring the light of broad Christian love and toleration to the more benighted denominations.

Perhaps the basic barrier in the way of a cooperative program of religious education at the universities, is the lack of sympathy and knowledge. People do not generally know what is actually being done and how far developments in this line have made progress. Nor have we put ourselves enough in the other fellow's place to be in a position to view the situation as intelligently as we should. A broad acquaintance with churches, their ultimate goal and genius, their peculiar contribution to society and the way they have been blessed in the sacrificial efforts, in spite of their shortcomings, would create an appreciation of them. A warm acquaintance with some of their choicest souls would result in supplanting suspicion with confidence, prejudice with trust and jealousy with love. No church is producing all the saints, no one is converting all the sinners, no one is evangelizing the whole world, no one is helping all the needy, no one enjoys the stamp of divine approval to the exclusion of all others; in other words, no one holds priority rights to God's attention and favor. No communion has done or experienced all these things nor is it very probably a guardian of the whole truth, but there is on the other hand no communion which is not actively helping to do and to experience all these things as well as to make its contribution in guarding the whole truth.

In the great field of human betterment these communions are essentially one. They are Comrades in the service of mankind, and sons in the worship of God. Yet on every hand we are acting as if ignorant of this basic fact. On the great broad lines, which after all is practical and potential Christianity, we have been co-operating, through other agencies to be sure, but none the less real.

The time is here when we should seriously attempt to usher in a period of appreciation and good will between denominations. Actual head and heart knowledge will accomplish wonders. When church members become sufficiently Christian to seek earnestly for the good in other communions, co-operation will be their inevitable *modus operandi*.

This transformation can be effected in the educational field,

as perhaps nowhere else. Particularly well do the subjects in religious education lend themselves to the accomplishment of this result. The path is becoming better defined each succeeding year. The advent of historic and scientific method makes more clear the main line of advance in the labyrinth of diverging and converging trails. Truth knows but one path and has no sectarian proclivities. Science plays havoc with strictly denominational interpretation in its insistence upon following the lead of fact. This means greater and greater limitation of the studies yielding exclusively to denominational teaching and to the enlargement of the field which can be presented and interpreted as well by members of one communion as of another. The scientific and strictly denominational interpretation of facts are apt to advance in inverse ratio to each other.

More and more lines of cleavage are appearing between "liberal and conservative schools." These lines cut squarely across all denominations. They affect not only the nature of the teaching, but the subject matter as well. While dividing the field, they define, and thus because of cutting across all by forming them into two great groups, greatly enlarge the sphere of co-operation. The chief object of concern today to both great camps is the point of view. This question having been answered very little interest is manifested in discovering the denominational leanings of a given teacher or author. Not only are text and reference books selected because of their point of view, rather than because of denominational origin, but even schools are being chosen on this criterion. For example: the Divinity School of the University of Chicago and the School of Religious Education of Boston draw liberal-minded students from a wide range of denominations; whereas, Princeton Theological Seminary and Moody Bible Institute attract students more conservatively inclined from just as wide a range of communions. The mistrust is more between schools of thought within denominations than between denominations as wholes. Denominational cooperation in the sphere of religious instruction, therefore, will be centered in two groups of kindred spirits in the various denominations. This having been determined, the further solution of the problems revolves about the two foci of subjects and teachers.

What subjects can be taught advantageously to classes com-

posed of students from different communions? Such subjects will lie very naturally outside of the range of peculiar denominational interests. It would seem that there would be no serious controversy in the Old Testament field. We know no such thing as Methodist Old Testament History, Baptist Old Testament Theology, Congregational Old Testament Introduction, Presbyterian Palestinian Geography or Lutheran Archeology, nor are there any serious denominational distinctions in New Testament Introduction and New Testament History. There are no sectarian findings on how to teach Greek or Hebrew, nor have the various communions developed different histories of the Christian Church, at least, as far as the period of the Reformation. In the fields of the philosophy of religion, the psychology of religion and the history of religion, there is no denominational criterion. Nor have any denominational lines of cleavage been detected in the fields of social science and of philanthropy. Religious education, even by denominational groups, cannot be properly appreciated unless the general field is covered, both as regards method and material. Assuming a given point of view, no denominational differences as such appear in the above named subjects. There is here then just as good a field for cooperative effort when scientifically taught as is to be found in geology, psychology and biology. The traditional and scientific points of view in reference to the last named group of subjects is just as irreconcilable as they are in the Biblical field.

A fundamental point, however, with all groups is the character and ability of the teacher. Has he a warm heart and a real religious experience; is he prepared for his position and can he handle his subject; does he inspire his students to higher thinking and living; these are vital considerations. Granting the teacher has these qualifications, his denominational relations will prove no barrier to his efficiency in instructing those of other labels.

The church forces can never gain and hold the respect of great numbers of thoughtful students and of members of the faculty until they can show by example that they can meet on the fair open field of science in the quest for truth. Until they can do this they will continue to be dubbed dogmatists and bigots by many and thus lose to their support large numbers of the most

thoughtful of their rightful supporters. Dogmatism, as such, is so loathed in the university that it is nothing short of fatal for the church to give to the student during perhaps the four most formative years of his life the impression that it is dogmatic and bigoted.

A comprehensive view of the field reveals the fact that much has already been accomplished in the way of cooperation in the field in question. General trust and confidence is growing up between individuals of different groups within the two great schools of thought. A given denominational college or seminary today may and often does have as many or more students from homes of other faiths than of its own. General recognition of the position of others is well illustrated at the State or Provincial University of Toronto, where a liberal number of credit hours is granted in the broad field of religious knowledge. These subjects may be taken in the affiliated college of the student's own denomination, whether Catholic or Protestant.

A closer type of cooperation is in practice at Montreal, where the Theological faculties of the different denominational colleges have organized themselves into a single great Theological faculty to teach the various subjects to students of all groups indiscriminately, except those subjects of strictly denominational character. These more sectarian titles are being taught to students by professors of their own churches, in their own respective institutions. They thus study together as a great common denomination the vast body of Christian truth and leave to each denominational faculty the responsibility of teaching its own students what they should know about the genius and tenets of their own communion.

This is exactly what a union school of religion at an American State university might well aspire to do, for no single denomination can afford to maintain such a wealth of teaching ability. The Toronto plan may not be feasible in our country because each denomination already has all the seminaries it can support and cannot build up at all the state universities, schools of such high grade and extent as would be required. The Montreal plan in simplified form seems not only feasible and practicable, but apparently the best and perhaps the only one which can meet the situation. Here denominational representation on the com-

mon faculty would be limited to the needs of the churches concerned. The maximum cooperation, specialization and confidence would be secured in this way at the minimum expense and suspicion.

There are other examples of interdenominational cooperation in this field among seminaries and training schools of the United States. Among the most conspicuous of these are two in New York City: the Union Theological Seminary and the Biblical Seminary in New York. Numerous other examples of various kinds could be cited, but these will suffice to point out the fact that interdenominational cooperation in this field not only exists at the present time but is succeeding admirably.

The psychological effect upon the student of interdenominational credit courses is difficult to estimate. By the student, values are determined largely in credit hours. Subjects worthy of his time and attention are counted toward his degree. Those failing to receive this recognition are tabooed, shunned and considered to be of little value. Universities which do not grant credit for high grade work, done in the field of religious knowledge, while not intentionally doing so, do nevertheless undermine the respect the student has for religion. At Toronto and McGill the study of religion because of its broad treatment enjoys the same honorable mention as other subjects of the curriculum. It is given its proper place among the scholastic pursuits because it is not represented by a conglomeration of competing sects, but by a unified organism of Christian cooperators. With religion thus commanding the respect of students and faculty, recruiting and training for Christian leadership is greatly facilitated.

With the growth of the state university so far surpassing that of the denominational college, religious educators are beginning to take stock of the situation and to inquire what can be done in behalf of the students' religious instruction in these great centers. Upon inquiry it has been learned that the presidents of the universities are as favorable as expediency will allow them to be toward any broad-gauged interdenominational program that will safeguard and serve the interests of all. They have in some places, in their desire to meet the need, even granted credit for work done by single communions.

If such concessions can be made to separate groups, the

broader interdenominational program will naturally present not only a much simpler problem for the administration but also a better psychological effect both upon student, faculty and general public. Respect and confidence increase in the ratio of groups represented in the cooperative effort. The administration of the University is assured of the minimum of objections from those not interested as well as of higher academic standards.

Some months ago a brief questionnaire sent to the religious workers in the universities of the United States, showed that there was an almost universal recognition of need of interdenominational credit courses in the field of religious education. This insistent demand is born out of the growing conviction that the educational approach is after all the fundamental one, and that it can be most effective when undertaken in a broad non-sectarian fashion.

Nothing can atone for fatal undermining evil psychological influences. They are usually determinative and final. No system of pastoral care, however well planned and conducted, can compensate for these terrific losses. Unless a positive line of teaching and influence be afforded the student and unless his thinking and attitude of mind be set right, the evangelistic and social programs will have little redemptive power. As Professor Ross, of Union, said: "The Kingdom will not come so much by convulsion as by education." Perhaps we can even more appropriately say that in these intellectual centers, abiding inspiration for higher living will come, not so much by exhortation as by information. The student shuns exhortation, but seeks information. Though He is open to this path of approach, but few denominations there be who find it. Did the churches appreciate the seriousness of the situation they would seek an immediate solution. The time is here when we should call a general disarmament conference to seek ways and means of relieving ourselves of the crushing load of competitive denominational armament and thus guarantee a lasting peace functioning through not only a League of Nations, but also a League of Denominations. Co-operation in the field of religious education in our universities is imperative for self preservation.

Christian Education

VOLUME V

OCTOBER, 1921-JULY, 1922

Published Monthly, Omitting August and September, by
THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

Robert L. Kelly, *Editor*

111 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter October 24th, 1921, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18th, 1918.

The subscription price is 50 cents per annum; ten or more copies 40 cents each, 10 cents must be added if payment is made by check. Single copies, 10 cents each.